

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/877,695	DESJARLAIS, JOHN R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marjorie A. Moran	1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marjorie A. Moran.

(3) John Desjarlais.

(2) Ramon Tabtiang; Kenton Abel.

(4) Joyce Morrison.

Date of Interview: 12 September 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Statutory subject matter, and the current Guidelines were discussed. The examiner explained what she thought of as "concrete" and "tangible" in view of the Guidelines. She stated that "outputting" a result or a similar limitation indicating communication to one performing the method usually is sufficient to meet the "tangible requirement. The examiner suggested that applicant use a term which is supported by the original specification or Figures to avoid introducing new matter. No agreement for specific claim language was reached. The attorneys pointed out that the "producing" steps of claims 60 and 61 are those of producing an actual protein or proteins. In view of this, the examiner agreed that these claims are statutory .